



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/667,355

09/23/2003

Anthony Bessios

57941.000016

3399

38013

7590

06/14/2006

HUNTON & WILLIAMS LLP/RAMBUS INC.
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT
1900 K STREET, N.W.
SUITE 1200
WASHINGTON, DC 20006-1109

EXAMINER

VO, DON NGUYEN

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2611

DATE MAILED: 06/14/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/667,355	Applicant(s) BESSIONS ET AL.	
	Examiner DON N. VO	Art Unit 2611	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 September 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-49 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-49 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>12/23/03&10/27/04</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION***Double Patenting***

1. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

2. Claims 1-49 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-17, 21-38, 41-48, 51-58 and 61 of copending Application No. 10/878,342. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because of their wording variations. The corresponding of claims are as followed:

Claims 1 and 18 of copending Application No. 10/878,342 to claim 1 of instant application;

Claims 2-17 of copending Application No. 10/878,342 to claims 2-17 of instant application, respectively;

Claims 21 and 38 of copending Application No. 10/878,342 to claim 18 of instant application;

Claims 22-37 of copending Application No. 10/878,342 to claims 19-34 of instant application, respectively;

Claims 41 and 48 of copending Application No. 10/878,342 to claim 35 of instant application;

Claims 42-47 of copending Application No. 10/878,342 to claims 36-41 of instant application, respectively;

Claims 51 and 58 of copending Application No. 10/878,342 to claim 42 of instant application;

Claims 52-57 of copending Application No. 10/878,342 to claims 43-48 of instant application, respectively; and

Claim 61 of copending Application No. 10/878,342 to claim 49 of instant application.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

3. Claims 1-6, 8-14, 18-22, 25-32, and 49 are also provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-6, 14-20, 24-28, 37-44, and 45 of copending Application No. 10/849,153.

Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because of their wording variations. The corresponding of claims are as followed:

Claims 1-6 of copending Application No. 10/849,153 to claims 1-6 of instant application, respectively;

Claims 14-20 of copending Application No. 10/849,153 to claims 8-14 of instant application, respectively;

Claims 24-28 of copending Application No. 10/849,153 to claims 18-22 of instant application, respectively;

Claims 37-44 of copending Application No. 10/849,153 to claims 25-32 of instant application, respectively;

Claim 45 of copending Application No. 10/849,153 to claim 49 of instant application, respectively;

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Conclusion

4. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. References Tanizaki et al (6,147,544), Cottatelucci (4,524,462), Whang (3,988,676), Price et al (3,940,694), Ching (3,781,686), and Tazaki et al (3,733,550) are cited because they are pertinent to multi-level communication system.

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DON N. VO whose telephone number is (571) 272-3018. The examiner can normally be reached on MON - FRI (9:00-6:30).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, JAY PATEL can be reached on (571) 272-2988. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



DON N. VO
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2611